



# METHODIST PROTESTANT.

## RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

For the Methodist Protestant.

The Fourth Annual Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church, for the Genesee District, met in Clockville, Oct. 2, 1833.—Sermon by Rev. Dr. James Covell.

The following is the stationing of the preachers:

Rev. Nicholas N. Bort, President.  
Portage Circuit—Orren Miller, Superintendent; Sidney S. Brown, Assistant.  
Canestoe Circuit—Seneka Fish, Superintendent.

Penfield and Rochester—William Williams, Superintendent.

Utica and Schuyler Circuits—Perry H. Chapel, Superintendent; James Wilder, Assistant.

Hannibal Ct.—Morris Baldwin, Superintendent; Matthew Lewis, Trumbul Kent, Assistants.

Conquest Circuit—Joshua Reese, Superintendent.

Castile Circuit—Veranus Brownell.

Binghampton—Abram Reynolds, Superintendent; Chandler Seward, Assistant.

Lenox Circuit—Zenas Covell, Superintendent; Peter Parslon, Assistant.

Richmond Circuit—Robert Andrews.

Roze Circuit—Charles Mills.

Ogden Circuit—To be supplied by the Superintendent of Holley Circuit.

Holley Circuit—Dr. James Covell.

Batavia—Isaac Fister.

Dryden Mission—Daniel White.

Hamilton Mission—Asa Graham.

William Smith, not having complied with his engagement to the Conference, is deposed from the travelling connexion.

James Heath, Henry Lyon, Nathaniel Ames, J.J. Miller, Superannuated—also Thomas Buck.

There were four Deacons and one Elder ordained at the Conference.

Delegates to General Conference—Rev. Dr. J. Covell and Hon. Sylvanus Teeber.

Eden Foster, continued Steward.

Our increase this year is 300 members and 12 ministers and preachers.

The following are amongst the Resolutions of Conference, viz:

*Resolved*, That this Conference approve of the Book Agent's edition of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History 4to. and Prideaux's Connexion, and will use their efforts to sustain the same.

*Resolved*, That we approve of the publication by our Book Agent, of Dr. Clark's Commentary, and that we will patronize the work, and use our influence to promote its circulation and sale.

*Resolved*, That each preacher be advised to use his influence in Quarterly Conference to adopt the best plan for promoting the circulation and sale of all those books published by the Book Agent of the M. P. Church, and that the members of the Quarterly Conferences be recommended to concur in the above resolution.

*Resolved*, That our Delegates to the General Conference be, and are hereby instructed to op-

pose any attempts that may be made in the General Conference to alter the Itinerant system so as to do away the right of our ministers to membership in the Annual Conference, who take one or more appointments from the stationing authority of the said Conference—and also, that we are not in favor of a general superintendent.

*Resolved*, That our Delegates, &c. are requested to urge the passage of a rule to consider the manner of holding our class meetings and love-feasts to be regulated by the Quarterly Conferences of the Circuits, and by the Leaders meeting in Stations.

And *Resolved*, That they do not consent to any alteration in our Articles of Faith.

*Resolved*, That our Delegates to General Conference are authorized to act discretionary in the exercise of their duties in all other matters concerning which they have not been instructed.

Our next Conference meets in Conquest, Cayuga County, New York, on the first Tuesday in October, 1834, at 9 o'clock, A. M.

ABRAHAM PENNELL, Secretary.

For the Methodist Protestant.

VIRGINIA.

Abingdon, November 5, 1833.

Mr. Editor,—Some time having elapsed since the close of the Methodist Protestant Camp-meeting, held in the vicinity of Abingdon; and seeing no communication in our church paper, relative to the same: the cause of this supineness, in those persons competent for such a duty, I am at a loss to know. Unless it be this, that the number of converts was small, and in their view not possessing the character that would be thought very cheering, or encouraging to the brethren wherever dispersed—but be that as it may, I am taught to regard the soul of man, as being of infinite value. And going upon the hypothesis, that there were but one soul converted from the error of his ways, at a camp-meeting, and finally saved, I ask, would not the salvation of such a soul, be ample compensation for five, six or seven days labour of praying and preaching? You have no doubt anticipated my answer.

But to proceed somewhat in detail, our meeting commenced on the day contemplated, viz. 19th of Sept. favored with fine weather, the order of the encampment consisted of five tents and an arbour.

On Saturday it commenced raining, and continued for the most part of the day, which prevented many from repairing to the camp ground, though at this stage of the meeting, the work of the Lord, had in some degree commenced. Sunday proved to be a beautiful day, and a large concourse of people were in attendance. Bro. Burgess preached the first sermon in the morning with much seeming animation—after which, the supper of the Lord Jesus was celebrated, and a goodly number partook thereof; amongst the number that communed, were Episcopal

Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, &c. O it was a melting time, "of refreshing from the presence of the Lord." Bro. Thompson, of Lynchburg Station, preached the second sermon, with much power, and as I humbly conceived, with the holy ghost, and with much assurance; his discourse was well calculated to awaken and convince the sceptick. At the conclusion of which, sinners were invited to the altar, and not a few came forward, and it appeared to me, to be "a place of broad rivers and streams"—the Lord was present to wound and to heal.

At the close of the meeting, it was stated that 12 or 13 had found the pearl of great price, in the bosom of religion—but the full amount of good that was effected, on that occasion, it will take time to develop—I trust there were many lasting impressions of good made on the hearts of numbers, and hope never will be effaced—and that there was much, very much prejudice removed from the minds of the public, and I trust swept away forever, in relation to the principles of Methodist Reform.

I now ask again, if the salvation of one soul, is of such value; what will the amount of 12 or 13 be? Is this not sufficient to excite ministers and preachers, to be instant in season and out of season? And to spread abroad the welcome news, that sinners are coming home to God, though the number may be small. Most excellent order prevailed, during the whole of the meeting.

Ministers in attendance, Brothers Comann, —, Perciville, Burgess, Thompson, Bulard, —, Whitfield, Shaver, beside some transient preachers.

Bro. Comann's frequent addresses, whilst amongst us, inculcated this pleasing sentiment, that the church of Christ is blooming with holiness, and ripening fast for the harvest of glory.

Yours, &c. THOMAS SPRAGEN.

For the Methodist Protestant.

ALABAMA TERRITORY.

Cane Hill, Washington Co. Oct. 10, 1833.

Dear Brother,—Our Camp-meeting closed last week, it was truly a time of refreshing from the Lord—twenty-five souls or more were converted, and several back sliders reclaimed. Our much beloved and worthy President, Joseph Walker, and William —, Missionary, were in attendance with us. Brother Walker gave an exposition of our principles on Sabbath, much to the satisfaction of all the people, except a few old side bigots, and I believe they feel like giving up the ship, for Bro. Walker's arguments were so clear, weighty and conclusive, that those itinerant masters in the old school could not help feeling their flimsy edifice give way—they saw that the people received the truth, and the people believed the truth would make them free.

The Sabbath following, one of these masters, at a camp-meeting of theirs, attempted to coun-



teract Bro. Walker's exposition, and also assailed his character, but all to no purpose—his exposition and character stand like a nail in a sure place. The Lord is on our side, and the people too, and he that spits against the wind, spits in his own face. And I was told that their four days' meeting closed, having all the features of a meeting that God disapproved.

Our cause is gaining, and has taken deep root in Washington. Our President will give you the particulars of the meeting.

Yours, &c. JACOB SEXTON.

For the Methodist Protestant.

BRO. A. G. BREWER, writes from Milledgeville, Georgia, under date of the 7th inst.

"Our Camp-meeting in De Kalb County, of this State, was concluded last Monday week; and taking the coolness of the weather into view, it was an excellent meeting. There were a considerable number of persons who professed to have obtained religion, and several have joined the church.

"We have a most interesting cause to stimulate our people to active effort, but alas, too many appear indifferent, and it would seem that nothing short of Eternity, with all its majestic solemnities will truly awake them to a just sense of duty and active effort.

"Much interest is expressed with the lips by many of our people relative to Religious Liberty, but at the same time, they appear too content with saying only.

"I do not mean to be understood, that this indifference applies to all—not so, there are those who say much and do much, and there are others who say less and do a great deal."

#### OHIO CONFERENCE.

*Extracts from the Minutes of the Conference.*

(Concluded from page 160.)

Suppose our members should habitually neglect to worship the Almighty God, till our houses of worship should be left nearly empty; who does not see that this would be a stab at the Gospel itself?—that it would impede the progress of Christianity through the earth, and consequently would militate against the salvation of mankind? And must such delinquents pass unnoticed, because it cannot be made appear that they neglect all the means of grace? So says that method of construing discipline, against which we are entering our protest, and against which the dearest interests of the Saviour's disciples require a decided stand.

Our government is mild and tolerant on this subject; it allows delinquents, however habitual in their neglect, to withdraw from the fellowship of the church, without being subjected to the decision of a judicial tribunal. This is done to accommodate difference of opinion on this subject. Other churches may differ from us, concerning what are the means of grace; and if any of our members neglect any part of those means in our catalogue, through a difference of opinion, they have a right to withdraw from us and to go to some other branch of the universal church. But if they will not conform to our regulations, and will not voluntarily withdraw from our communion, this looks like an intention on their part to stay with us to hinder our prosperity, and to use their utmost influence to overturn our institution, as a distinct branch of the Christian community. Therefore we have a right, upon all the principles of religion and charity, either to bring them to a conformity to

what we deem the means of grace, or otherwise to separate them from our fellowship.

We are aware, that in neglecting class-meetings, domestic circumstances often furnish an apology, and sometimes, perhaps a full justification. Therefore we require of our officers to visit such individuals to ascertain these facts; and when a leader finds that a member of his class is detained by affliction or domestic burdens as females especially frequently are, he ought not to report any such members to the superintendent, as subjects for admonition.

But where those or such like grounds of apology do not exist, the matter is without excuse; and we think that in too many instances the habitual neglect of class-meetings among our members, evinces a serious declension in piety, and that could they be brought to the test, they would be found equally negligent in reading the scripture, in private and family prayer, and in most of the other instituted means of salvation. There is serious cause to apprehend, that their indifference to the social meetings of the saints, is the result of luke-warmness, or other evils of the heart; and that they do not feel that interest in the cause of our Redeemer, which its importance requires.

In conclusion, we recommend to all our executive officers to look at the subject on all sides: to avoid every thing like oppressing the poor or the afflicted, and at the same time to be vigilant in maintaining that orderly and wholesome government, on which our ultimate prosperity depends.

Adopted; and Signed in behalf of the Conference.

GEO. BROWN, President.

JOHN CLARKE, Secretary.

Methodist Correspondent.

For the Methodist Protestant.

Lenox, November 2, 1833.

Bro. Harrod,—I wish you to give the following an insertion in the Methodist Protestant.

JOHN P. WEBB.

We the undersigned, a Committee appointed by the Genesee Annual Conference, at its last session, to apportion the salary of the President among the respective Circuits and Stations within the bounds of said District—find the following to be the amount, viz:

President's salary \$260.

Circuits, Stations and Missionary fields, \$15 (exclusive of Ogden.)

The amount each circuit has to pay, is seventeen dollars and thirty-three cents, equal to four dollars and thirty-three cents quarterly, which the Stewards of the respective Circuits and Stations will pay over to the President, on his personal application.

ZENAS COVAL,

SYLVANUS TEEBER,

JOHN P. WEBB,

} Apportioning  
Committee.

#### THE CHRISTIAN'S HOPE.

This restlessness in our present condition—this looking out on the future—the instinctive love of being never satisfied in the present life, but always looking forward to another, has often been considered an intimation furnished by our very constitutions, of our immortality. Yet, it is at most only an intimation; the instinctive desire of being cannot prove with any degree of certainty the existence of a future state—cannot give assurance to the mind—cannot be a solid foundation of a rational hope. On what then rests the Christian's hope? On the promises of

God. This is surely a rational hope; and it will produce purity of heart and life. It is an anchor to the soul. And now I ask what infidelity has to offer as a substitute for the Christian's hope?—*Zion's Advocate.*

#### ECCLESIASTICAL.

We insert the following article from a leading member of the Quarterly Conference of Roanoke Circuit, in reply to "Onesimus," "Peter," and the Editor of this paper—so far as the latter is concerned, (and he can vouch for his correspondents also,) he is willing to correct any error he may have written.—But while he makes this remark, he is perfectly willing to abide the decision of the readers of this journal, whether the documents furnished by some brethren themselves, as well as the sentiments received and published did not fully authorize the impression that those brethren (composing the majority of the quarterly conference who passed the celebrated Roanoke Resolutions,) were opposed to our Itineracy?

Can any quarterly conference of our church pass a resolution desiring the abolishment of the office of superintendent or stationed minister, and requesting that the duties of the superintendent should be performed by the class leaders, and be friends to the Methodist Protestant Itineracy? We ask if this be not sufficient, if there were no other evidence to induce the belief that they were not cordial friends to a bona fide itinerant ministry, such as is known and acknowledged in the Methodist Protestant Church?

We have thought it due to those brethren who passed those resolutions, to publish their reply; although there are some things which we believe will not meet the approbation of our readers generally.

As brother Bellamy acknowledges himself the author of those (in our opinion) anti-Methodistical resolutions, and as we have given him an opportunity to reply, and shew either that they are not subversive of our itinerant system of operation, or that we have misunderstood him, we of course consider that his reply covers the whole ground of defence of the resolutions—and therefore, as is customary, shall permit brother Harris, "Onesimus," and "Peter," suitably to reply and explain, if they think proper; and thus close the discussion.

For the Methodist Protestant.

Mr. Editor,—I feel it a duty incumbent on me and as due to truth and to our church, to correct some erroneous statements made through the medium of the Methodist Protestant, in reference to some misunderstanding in the Roanoke Circuit of North Carolina; especially the resolutions of the quarterly conference thereof.

I have no desire either to deal in vituperation or to impute improper motive to any reflections made by yourself, "Peter," or "Onesimus," on the resolutions passed in the Roanoke Quarterly Conference: but if it be severe to say that



you and your correspondents wrote under incorrect views in relation to our church matters, you and they should bear it for the truth's sake, and I will bear all that rumour, with her thousand tongues has reiterated about our "being no friends to a bona fide itinerant ministry, or good order;" and representing us as "favoring Congregationalism," with designs to sink the itinerants into utter insignificance;" and moreover that we were "anarchists," &c.

It may be proper Mr. Editor, on this occasion, and in view of our defence, to present a few fundamental principles of government, and a short history of facts, as the latter have transpired before your readers; hoping these will place things in their proper view, and conceiving that truth and candour as imperiously demand that you should give them publicity, as that I should furnish them.—But for these and the welfare of the church, all the severe allegations filed by our president against the mover of the resolutions calculated to impress your readers that I am a mischievous person, one who was endeavouring to spread "jealousies and discontent" in the church, might pass as unheeded by me, and as harmless as the wind which may whistle over my grave when I have retired from the turmoils of life.

All men, when they associate for mutual aid and protection or general good, cede to the constituted authority the right of deciding when each is in the legal possession of a right, or in the lawful pursuit of happiness, and when they forfeit them.—The only legitimate objects of any association or government are to promote the happiness and protect the governed from the foreign and domestic aggression or usurpation of the social rights of each. And no man or set of men has any legal right to use authority, (however expressly delegated that authority may be,) to favour action in one, and proscribe it in another, or in any manner to fetter or control action or opinion, unless that action or opinion in its exercise would infringe the rights of others, or injure in some way the general welfare.

There are two kinds of government yet extant, each struggling for the ascendancy; viz. despotism and liberty. The first claims the authority to rule, being vested directly by heaven in some favored individual or set of men on account of fortuitous birth or function, who are not responsible to any power on earth for the faithful administration of office; and to them belong plenary powers to appoint agents and sub-agents, as their deputies, stewards, superintendents or overseers, to execute their mere will as discipline on all the members of government, to suppress rebellion and punish licentiousness. This brings the power down on the people.

The other declares all power inherent in the people, and that each member of the government possesses the same equal rights and powers, and all combine to delegate, by express voice, as much of their power as is necessary and proper to promote and secure their liberty and happiness, to some individual worthy to rule; and this individual is held responsible to the people, his constituents, for the faithful administration of his office. This kind brings the power up from the people over their rulers.

Either of these may fall short of good government, and prove onerous and tyrannical. Free government is better calculated to foster and cherish the noble principles of the virtuous and good, than to correct and punish the licentious

practices of the abandoned and vile; and despotism by severe laws and strict subordination may rule to servile fear and restraint the sycophant and corrupted libertine; but it proffers not to its votaries any incentive that will call into action the slumbering ambition of moral worth, nor cheering smile to exhilarate deponding virtue. Free governments often lack energy, and despotic ones generally abuse power, and for an ignorant and corrupted people despotism is best, but for an intelligent and virtuous community a representative form is far preferable. Perfection in the attributes of Deity constitute the necessary, unchangeable and eternal rectitude of the divine nature; virtue in an enlightened and free creature is a conformity of disposition and practice to that rectitude. In moral law there can be no question of the moral obligation of implicit obedience from man as an intelligent creature to his Creator; for unerring wisdom, unbounded love and eternal truth have all been engaged in devising a system of laws to promote and secure the eternal peace and happiness of man. But in all human regulations we too often find self-interest and private ambition the most conspicuous pillars in the edifice.

Some of the Protestant Methodists seem to think, that all the power in the churches is derived from the general conference, or the constitution; and among these "Peter" and "Onesimus" may be numbered. From whatever source "Onesimus" might have derived his liberty, is of minor consideration, or upon what ground "Peter" bottoms his power over the church. I will say the church of God is a free city of right; and ought not to be in bondage to "Philemon," or another man or set of men. The constitution never did nor never can give any power to the churches, nor does it give any to the general conference; but is simply positive proof, *legal testimony* of the grant of power being made from one party to another; the constitution is the *written deed* that attests the transit of right and title. A question then will arise who was the original holder, and how much has passed? To this I will answer in the language of the last clause in the constitution, viz: "whatever power may be necessary to the formation of rules and regulations is inherent in the ministers and members of the church, &c. and that all power not delegated, &c. is retained to said ministers and members." Page 34. Therefore I conclude, that as our quarterly conference, which is the association of the churches in the circuit, have never ceded the right to instruct their delegates to the annual conference, they still possess that right. Take away this right of instruction, and you break up the foundation of all order; for place supremacy where you may, it must command obedience to its dictate, or else every one will do what seems right in his own eyes, and confusion will ensue. I hesitate not to say that every detriment to this action of the sovereign people through their representatives duly instructed, is a despotic feature in any church polity; and that it is calculated forever to distract and control the bodies in which these (divinely authorised) agents are placed.

There are but two ends to be answered by christian association, viz: to get good and to do good. The different members of the church are all under obligations to promote these ends. If to effect them, it requires that some, whose experience qualifies them for rule and edification, or some whose zeal and energy qualify them for

missionary labours, should devote, at the request of their brethren, the whole or a large part of their time, to these works; a necessary obligation rests on the church to sustain them under their labours. This is all they can demand. If they place themselves in any other attitude towards the church and their brethren than merely that of ministering servants, their conduct is irreligious and criminal; and we need not wonder that such woful effects have followed such pretensions and presumptuous conduct of men under the names of ministers of the gospel." Make up a conference entirely of representatives from the different churches, acting under instructions from their respective constituents, and you will have a free body counseling each other like brothers, for mutual aid and general good. This is free government, for here the power of the governed preponderates over the governors.—But make a conference of all itinerants by divine or ministerial appointment, and we all acknowledge it a despotism, for here the power of the governors preponderates over the governed. And when the two parties are put in equilibrium, like ours, what is it but a collision of liberty and despotism; of right and wrong? They may struggle for awhile for the ascendancy, but there can be no doubt what will be its ultimate finale.

Our president says "there are only five who ever complained." To the law and the testimony I appeal. During the sitting of the conference of North Carolina, in 1833, a report was made by brother Grant, embracing the following extract, viz: "They (the com.) find however, that the last annual conference instead of assigning stations to some of our ministers, apportioned their labours and services under the term '*extra ministerial aid*,' which term is not found in our constitution, and if persevered in will vacate their seats in the annual conference." And when this report was read, brother Hill, to make this clause more emphatic, moved to append to the report a resolution from which the following is extracted: "That every ordained minister from the district, who shall consent to receive from the stationing power of this body any amount of official labour, is thereby made an itinerant minister in a constitutional sense; and that we will practice upon the principles herein embraced." To shew that this was president Harris' construction of the constitution when he had just returned from the convention, I will assert, that I so understood him to express himself to our annual conference that adopted the constitution, and but for this recognition of the local ministers to equal rights with the itinerants it would never have been adopted by us. But your readers, Mr. Editor, shall not take a simple ego dico for evidence, I will extract from the record of the conference that adopted it.

*Resolved*,—That a committee consisting of William E. Bellamy, Willis Harris, and John F. Bellamy, be appointed to examine into the eligibility of the representatives to this conference, &c. Whereupon the following persons in addition to the above (ministers and delegates mentioned before) were found to be entitled to seats, viz: Joshua Swift, Swain Swift, Seth Speight, Josiah R. Horn, John Coe, John Moore, Alexander Albright, ministers; (all local preachers) and Richard Jones, &c. lay delegates."

And yet our president says this construction is "doubtless unconstitutional." Is it not strange that brother Harris, while yet warm



from the convention, should not have thought this unconstitutional then as well as now? But in farther confirmation of this being the view of a large majority of our last annual conference, I will add, that the stationing committee of that body of which brother S. Speight was chairman, made a report, which *did not assign stations* to all our ministers, and which report was not adopted, but was re-committed; and E. Grant and J. F. Bellamy, were added to the committee. Stations were then given to all our ministers, and the report was adopted. Now mark the "complainers." The first dissenting voice was that of brother John F. Speight, who was appointed superintendent to Gullford circuit, and while brother Travis Jones and other local preachers were appointed to stations, and he refused to abide the report; and another superintendent assured me, that if brother Speight had been silent he would have objected. I was astonished beyond measure, for this was precisely the same arrangement as that under which brother Speight and the other superintendents had commenced travelling among us. Here Mr. Editor, in my zeal to retain the itinerants, I introduced the following resolution, which has produced much of the mischief and confusion among us.

**"Resolved,**—That the term 'superintendent' in our constitution and discipline is understood to mean, the *preacher* who has the pastoral charge or authority over all the churches or stations within the circuit to which he may be appointed *as superintendent*."

The only thing in it that I now see contrary to the constitution, is the word *preacher*, and it is surely one of vast importance, for the constitution not only says "the *minister* who shall be appointed superintendent, &c;" but it keeps up the idea in the next item that none but a minister should be superintendent when it says "The minister or *preacher* appointed by the annual conference to assist, &c. shall be styled the assistant." Here then we see a preacher may be appointed according to the constitution, *assistant*, but not superintendent. Again, the duties of the superintendent cannot be performed by a preacher only, and all our superintendents but one were only licensed preachers. Were it to do over again, I avow I would not consent to place *mere licentiates* over elders, for they ought not thus to have the precedence. This was done late on Saturday, and satisfied the itinerants; but alas! in avoiding Scylla I ran into Charybdis. Early on Sunday morning, I found three elders, viz: William Bellamy, William W. Hill, and Jesse H. Cobb, unwilling so far to prostitute the dignity of elders' orders to the government and control of unordained preachers, as to acquiesce in the decision of the conference. So much was I grieved to find my every effort for conciliation abortive, that I retired early in the day with a sick heart to my distant home.

Here then, Mr. Editor, you have a true statement of our annual conference doings, and our difficulties; and let me ask all your candid readers who are elders, if they think the framers of our constitution ever designed that elders of either the local or itinerant ranks should be controlled by a superintendent if he was *even a deacon*? Would they receive the ordinances from his hands? Would they dare to do it? How then would the case be if he were only a licentiate? And yet such was the dire fate of our elders through my zeal and the hasty concurrence of our conference. And notwithstanding

this, I am charged with a desire to destroy the itineracy.

After this I was disposed to keep our dissonance to ourselves; and when your son, Mr. Editor, desired of me as keeper of the journal, a transcript of the above resolutions, I declined giving them to him; and when other brethren in our own district requested them, I persuaded them to let the strife "languish and die." To this they assented; but one of these "unconstitutional" superintendents sent to you new matter for dissention, and invited foreign aid as his allies, who had no more right to dictate to us, than we *now have* to tell the Maryland conference what they ought to do. Afterwards, S. J. Harris acknowledged to our quarterly conference that he was the author of that piece in your paper signed "Would-be-Itinerant," and regretting its publication, resigned the superintendency of every church or station to which a minister was appointed by the annual conference:—then for the first time I read some of the resolutions passed at a subsequent conference, and proposed the first for adoption, and it was adopted. At the second quarterly conference for the circuit, I offered the other seven, and they were adopted; and not one offered by me was rejected, but one contending for the equality of ministers was amended, and then withdrawn by me. Three others were read and withdrawn without any vote being taken on them at all. And on Monday, a committee was appointed by the chairman of the conference, (Gen. Eli B. Whitaker,) consisting of Doct. M. C. Whitaker, Col. T. Nicholson, and myself, who acted as chairman of the committee. The report of that committee embraces the three last published resolutions.

I will now, for the purpose of correcting all the mendacious reports in circulation, give it as my opinion, that no member of the conference was absent on Saturday, who resided within a convenient distance and who was not prohibited from attendance by domestic affliction or some other detriment beyond his control; for it was known that most of the resolutions had been read at a previous conference for their consideration and reflection, and would be offered at this one for adoption. On Saturday, Col. S. Whitaker was chosen chairman, and he was the only member absent on Monday, except the honorary member bro. Nash, of Virginia, who was present on Saturday, and he took no part in debate, but only spoke on rules of order. And further to correct the deprecated notions of a host of "illegal members voting among us." I will detail another fact also.—After the conference was organised, it was moved that brother Hill, one who was appointed by the annual conference, a missionary for the state, and was as much entitled to a seat among us as in any circuit; and brother Nash of Virginia, who had been for years an elder, and laboured much among us, who were present, be invited to *honorary* seats in our body; and they were admitted as such; but neither of them attempted to intrude their votes upon us; and these were the only ones that were not members that mingled in our counsels. This course of admitting official brethren to an opportunity of counsel with us upon business important to the prosperity of Zion, I believe did not originate with the Roanoke quarterly conference, but perhaps existed long before the days of the Apostles, for we read in the Old Testament, "that they that feared the Lord, spake often one to another," and surely he who bore to his master these

words of Paul, "I know thou countest me a partner, &c." will not deny that all true ministers every where are equal partners or joint-heirs in the kingdom of Jesus, and ought to advise one another as brothers. But I will come a little nearer home for a precedent set us of this christian "courtesy." In the journal of our annual conference, under the Associated Articles for 1828, I find that brother T. Moore, elder from Virginia, was invited to take a seat in the conference, and did so, without the smallest degree of compunction; and "if I be correctly informed," brother Samuel J. Harris, who was *not entitled to a seat* in the annual conference of North Carolina without election, was invited to a seat in a late Virginia annual conference, and in mutual good feeling, a brother from Virginia who came back to Carolina with him, who was not entitled to a seat in the Virginia conference but by election also, was invited and took a seat in the last annual conference of North Carolina, whether as "*corresponding members*" I shall leave for "Onesimus" to inform your readers. Yet with all these examples of common "courtesy" and christian union in those high and intelligent bodies, a poor insignificant quarterly conference, as you have been told by "Onesimus," of only 4 or 5 legal members, viz: the chairman, secretary, 2 itinerants, and the mover of the resolutions, must be *posted* and censured in paper after paper of your press, as indulging in some wild revolutionary projects, when they adhere to these "*firmly fixed first principles*." But perhaps "Onesimus" has already "received information enough" to tell your readers which is the most like rebellion to "first principles," the conduct of the Virginia annual conference in inviting a *mere licentiate*, who could not take a seat in his own district without being elected to represent the *laity*, to take a seat among and counsel *elders* and *deacons*; or the quarterly conference of Roanoke circuit who invited only *elders*, and who for years had been considered entitled to votes here, and capable of giving good advice both at home and abroad. I will correct another error.—It has been called a "propitious time," when 4 or 5 could pass resolutions; and that too at a called conference on Monday, *after* the quarterly conference, when a *number* of the official members had gone away; and, "but the authors, knowing that Rome was not built in a day, renewed their efforts on the following Monday, at an especial call of the quarterly meeting conference (I suppose for this very purpose) under more favorable circumstances, *some* of the Saturday's members being called to attend to indispensable duties of their profession."

Now, Mr. Editor, I will cheerfully admit that one is a "*member*" and that it is "*some*" also, but at the same time I assert, that according to Parliamentary law, that the mighty number which had gone away, could not have voted on Monday if he had remained in the chair, unless there had been a tie in the votes for and against the adoption of the report; and this is not likely, as there was not a *vote* against it; and had all voted against it who were opposed to it, I believe there would only have been two at the highest calculation, besides the two itinerants *proper*. And as the report of the committee was the only business of importance transacted on Monday, I call on Col. Spier Whitaker openly and frankly to say whether he would have voted for the adoption of the report or not, had he voted on it at all; and I think he owes it to the church to declare such vote. But the



"abettors of the resolution called an after conference."—This, I for one *deny*; and say further, that I do not believe that the motion to meet again came from any favourable to the resolutions, but from the opponents, (viz: to the 7th resolution, for I believe there was but little opposition to any but this one, of the first eight) and the only one constitutionally entitled to call a conference we all *know* is the superintendent, and I think, yes, I will say I *think* (for he does not always fill the pulpits, or have them filled, administer the ordinances, and do all the duties here as the constitution enjoins him to do) he called the conference to meet again on Monday.

This much, Mr. Editor, for correction of errors and a statement of facts in their stead, and if I am permitted, I will attend more particularly to president Harris.

President Harris is too cautious to name the "only five complainers," and therefore I shall guess he meant William W. Hill, William Bellamy, Jesse H. Cobb, Richard Davidson, and the mover of the *Odious Resolutions*. Of the first four, I will merely remark, that Wm. Bellamy drew up the first petition and remonstrance, and Wm. W. Hill the second, that advocated Reform in North Carolina—Wm. Bellamy first bearded Despotism in the District and Quarterly Conferences of the Episcopal Methodists, and Wm. W. Hill's exertions, zeal and usefulness, both at home and abroad, are known, felt and duly appreciated in our Church. Of the other two ministers I need only say, those who know them best, admire and applaud their integrity, piety and zeal. Such are the men who united *early* with Price, Hunter, Bradford, and others, in support of liberty; then the olive yielded to us its fatness; the fig tree its sweetness, and the vine its exhilarating wine; but the fire of the bramble devoured not the cedars of Lebanon.

President Harris says, "there are not ten persons in our fellowship in North Carolina who are in anywise favorable to *any* of the resolutions." Let us test this. The first resolution, I believe, had not a single opposer in the quarterly conference that passed it. There are yet some in this circuit who were Reformers, and had their names enrolled as such in the Roanoke Union Society, in 1824. Among these Eli B. Whitaker, William Bellamy, and Albritain Jones, are ministers, and these I am sure will not only approve this resolution which approbates the conduct of those who voted for the resolution, which recognises them as constitutionally entitled to a seat in the annual conference, but I venture to assert they will *occupy* those seats when convenient.

Of the laymen, there remain William E. Bellamy, Absalom Whitaker, Benjamin Hunter, Eli B. Whitaker, Jr. Exum Lewis, L. H. B. Whitaker, and John F. Bellamy, all of whom I have much reason to believe would approve it, for without recognising those ministers as entitled to seats in the annual conference, they *know* we should never have had nor could we now have an annual conference.

But President Harris' testimony shews the incorrectness of his assertion, for he says "and they (the ministerial brethren) told me that they would, God willing, attend our next annual conference in order to give by their votes!!! the untruth, &c." Now, how could they vote or even take their seats as members there, but in accordance with the doctrine embraced by this resolution of the annual conference? Their determination to *take their seats*, shows their approval of the voters for it.

President Harris says, "we dearly love some of the brethren who aided in bringing them to light," &c. I will brush away at once the insinuation that many caucussed together to become the parent of the first eight resolutions, by avowing myself to be the *sole* author, and that no man drafted or altered in the conference or out of it a single word in them before they were passed, that I recollect; therefore, if the criminality be so great as to pull down more than his *love* upon my devoted head, I have much cause to fear and tremble, but let the innocent go free.

President Harris adds, "leaving the burden of opposition on the shoulders of a young man who has charge of Roanoke Circuit, who at last, finding himself in the minority," (this he found out on Saturday, and on Monday he found none, no not one who voted against the adoption of the report, which embraces the three last resolutions,) "washed his hands in innocence by leaving the house," and I say very improperly, and the house in pity to his youth and inexperience sent after him for an explanation. But in innocence of what, Congregationalism? Let his words speak, he said substantially, just before he left the house, "I have been preaching for you half the year, I have received eight dollars, (his expenses had been nearly five,) and if some one or more societies will give me one hundred dollars I will preach to them," &c. As soon as he was gone, I called upon every friend to itineracy to come forward and pledge himself with me, in a written obligation, to make up the deficiency of the church, and wipe off the foul reproach which he had improperly cast in our teeth, merely because we would not be controlled by him in rejecting the report of the committee, which recommended the recall of those aged ministers of the gospel to their labours in the vineyard of the Lord. I will leave an intelligent and enlightened community to judge who advocates most Congregationalism, the brethren who made this declaration, or myself, who have made so such declaration, but called on the official brethren to aid me in giving to itineracy its most efficient support, viz. *its full pay*.

President Harris says, "It is true however, our last conference did pass a resolution which is doubtless unconstitutional; but it was done out of profound respect to the mover, in whom they suspected nothing like a design to bring to naught our itineracy." There are four grand features in this sentence worthy of notice and comment. First, the hint given that this resolution which recognises the title of local preachers to seats in the annual conference, is unconstitutional, and of course null and void; consequently their seats must be vacated by the President; and he cannot conscientiously grant them the short enjoyment of equality with the itinerants which they would otherwise participate in, until the nullification of the resolution by the general conference. Secondly, that of the great wisdom of our President, in so *clearly* seeing a thing which nobody else in the annual conference could discover, and which he did not see while he presided over that body; or if he saw it, silenced his conscience enough to let it pass unnoticed. Thirdly, that the members who voted for it, were *man* worshippers, and were led by a designing intriguer who wished to bring our itineracy to naught. And fourthly, that those who voted for it, cared more to please bro. Hill, the mover, than they did about keeping their moral obligation to abide the constitution.

Here let me ask, who are the men that have thus acted, to please bro. Hill? Let him point them out, and put his finger on all who *would do it* to ingratiate himself into the high favour of even Mr. President, or even to hinder his beloved itineracy from "coming to naught." He says some have avowed it, and "expressed hearty repentance for their error." Indeed it is a crime that calls *loudly* for repentance. It behoves each of the voters to ask, "Is it I?"—"Is it I?"—and let him give some token by which such — betrayers may be known, and the innocents cleared from such — aspersions. For my part, I cannot believe such charges against my brethren without proof positive. And yet he speaks thus immediately after congratulating "Peter" that we should "be able to wipe off the odium which ought never to have been cast on us as a conference."

But if it is so "charitable to presume that some of us have acted, without a proper investigation of the duties of the Superintendent," and have thus secured to ourselves all the clemency that wilful ignorance and buried talents are entitled to, what shall be the award of those who *knew their duty* as Superintendents and did it not?

Yours, &c.

JOHN F. BELLAMY.

For the Methodist Protestant.

#### AMICUS, ON THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CLASS LEADERS.

The duties of class leaders, in the Methodist Protestant Church, are numerous and highly important, consequently, their responsibilities to God and the church are very great. There are no officers in the church whose duties are more various and weighty; and on whose fidelity the spiritual and temporal interests of the church so much depend. There are none to whom the churches so immediately look for direction as to the class leaders; and there is no body of men in the whole church who possess and exercise greater influence over the people. The members will willingly part with a favorite preacher; but a class, blessed with a competent and faithful leader, will not readily consent to give him up if he can be retained. This attachment unquestionably grows out of the intimate and special duties of the leaders, and the various and important relations they sustain to the membership.

1. The class leaders are the *special ministers* to the members of their respective classes.

The discipline makes it their duty to meet their classes once a week, and to instruct their members in the principles and duties of christianity; to comfort them in affliction; to advise them in cases of difficulty; to exhort them to diligence and perseverance in doing and suffering the whole will of God; to visit them in sickness, and when delinquent in duty; and to promote the spiritual, temporal and eternal interests of those who may have placed themselves under the special care of the leader. No minister of the gospel is charged with more important and responsible duties. And it certainly will require an ample stock of knowledge, piety, prudence, and experience to enable any man to discharge profitably this part of a leader's duty. A novice or superficial christian would be utterly incompetent.

2. The class leaders are the *representatives* of their respective classes.

1st. In the leaders' meeting.

Here they discharge, as the representatives of the people, important duties; one of which is,



no less than that of deciding who shall, and who shall not be admitted to full membership in the church.

2d. In the Quarterly Conferences of stations and circuits.

Here the leaders exercise, as the *representatives* of the people, very important executive and judicial duties. They decide where and when the ministers appointed by the annual conference, shall officiate, and who shall be authorized to preach the gospel and administer the ordinances. They examine the character of every official member in the church, and have authority to administer and reprove those whom they may conceive to be delinquent. They hear and decide on all appeals made by the members from the decisions of committees of trial; and from *their* decisions the members have *no appeal*. We say the leaders, as the *representatives* of the classes, exercise all this authority, because they constitute a majority in attendance, of every quarterly conference, and are actually sent there as the *representatives* of the classes.

3. They are the solely authorized collectors of the church revenue, drawn from the voluntary contributions of the members of the classes. All of which it is made their duty to pay over weekly into the hands of the Steward or Treasurer of the station or circuit, to be applied as the discipline directs; and this officer's conduct and accounts are made to pass in review before them four times in the year, that they may be fully satisfied of his integrity in the application of the funds put into his hands.

These are important duties. Let us now inquire to whom are the leaders answerable for their official conduct. They are doubtless accountable to the Great Head of the church, and to Him will they finally have to answer for the manner in which they may have discharged their duty. But our discipline makes them accountable also to the church. First, to the leaders' meeting. Secondly, to the quarterly conference. And thirdly, to the classes. It is made the duty of the leaders' meeting to "inquire into the punctuality of each leader in meeting his class, visiting his sick and delinquent members, and his attendance at the leaders' meeting," "and all prudent means are to be employed to induce faithfulness in the discharge of duty." It is also made the duty of the quarterly conference, by the constitution, "to examine into the official character of all its members, and to admonish and reprove as occasion may require." And it is the prerogative of the classes "to elect leaders annually;" and, consequently, to leave out or displace those who are incompetent or unfaithful; so that the responsibility of leaders is tolerably well secured; yet, in our judgment, not sufficiently.

We do think the quarterly conference ought to have authority to displace incompetent or unfaithful leaders. Our reasons are; First, the classes have no right to displace an unsuitable leader until the lapse of a year. And even then, from inattention to the manner in which their leader performs duties, not immediately connected with the exercises of the class room, but which are, nevertheless, essential to the prosperity of the circuit or station, unsuitable leaders may be re-elected year after year, to the great injury of the church. Secondly, though the quarterly conference possesses power to examine into the official character of every leader, yet that body can only "admonish and reprove." And the leaders' meeting have authority only

to employ all "prudent means" to induce faithfulness; but it would not be prudent to break a leader under the sanction of existing rules. Now, as the quarterly conference embodies all the official members of the circuit or station; and, as all are deeply interested in the conduct of each officer of the church, it would seem proper and right, that this body should have authority, not only to admonish and reprove delinquent leaders, but also, in *obstinate cases*, to displace them.

Some have thought, the superintendents ought to have power to put leaders out of office when delinquent. We can no more accord with this sentiment than the fellow to it, which is, that the superintendents have authority to appoint leaders; or what amounts to the same thing, to nominate, and compel a choice from the nominations. That the superintendents should not possess either of these prerogatives, will be obvious from the fact, that the leaders are not the preachers' officers, as in the Methodist Episcopal church, but properly the *representatives* of the classes, are charged with executive and judicial duties of the greatest importance to the laity; and, in fact, constitute the conservators of the people's interests in all the spiritual and temporal concerns of the stations and circuits. To grant the superintendents power to displace or appoint those officers would at once be to subject every station and circuit to the entire control of the superintendent. It is, unquestionably, the power to make and break leaders that gives to the itinerant ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church the entire control of all the stations and circuits. Our discipline very wisely places the power to choose and displace class leaders in the hands of the membership, and admits of no nominations except in cases where classes neglect or refuse to appoint leaders. Yet, we believe, our system would be improved by increasing the responsibility of leaders, and granting to the quarterly conferences authority to displace such of them as are clearly proven to be incompetent or unfaithful.

We said, in a former paper, that "the constitution and discipline of the Methodist Protestant Church do clothe her rulers with ample power for all the purposes of good government." Now we ask, are not the leaders clothed with ample executive power for all the purposes of good government, so far as the local interests of the circuits and stations are concerned? Would it be proper or safe to give them more than they already have? Some persons, indeed, have proposed that the entire executive authority of the superintendents be transferred to the leaders; but would not this make the superintendents mere cyphers, and exclude the ministry from all executive authority in the stations and circuits? Instead of having one general superintendency in a circuit or station, we should then have from ten to fifty or more superintendents of paramount authority, within the limits of a single station or circuit. In this station (Baltimore) previously to its formation into two, there were 17 class leaders, at the head of as many classes. Suppose each one of these were clothed with the whole executive authority to execute discipline and conduct the general business of the station, what confusion would not obtain?

In a subsequent paper we will examine the duties and responsibilities of superintendents, and shew that they are clothed with ample power to execute discipline, and to carry into

effect their general superintendency, without possessing the power to put leaders into office, or to put them out when delinquent. We do think it may be clearly shown, that the agency of the class leaders, in our church, is necessary only in a *few* particulars to enable the superintendents to discharge their official duties. Harmony between the different parts of the government, and faithfulness in all the officers are certainly indispensable to the well being of every department, and to the prosperity of the whole church. But if we have in some places so much of human nature and insubordination as to produce discord, and to jeopardize wholesome government, we had better, if we cannot cure the evil, abandon those places to their fate, than destroy the liberties of the church, by introducing a preponderance of power on the part of any one order. *Amicus.*

For the Methodist Protestant.

Mr. Editor,—Thinking it probable, that "confidence and accountability" would be noticed, I sent on to you, sooner than I otherwise would have done, two other Nos. of extracts, the contents of which explain some points in the first; but I find, they came to hand too late. *Amicus* has misunderstood me, and (he says) he does not understand me. The first extract he has made, is connected immediately with a passage which explains it. I beg the reader's attention to it. "If all our rulers are made accountable, for the exercise of all their power; the amount of it, might be regulated by the demands for it. It may often happen, in new places, that a minister may have nearly all the knowledge and experience, like a father in a family, in such cases were he without the power to act as a father, and trust to the ignorant and the inexperienced, all might be lost." Now I was ready to admit, that such fatherly power, in such a case, might exceed any power recognized in the Methodist E. Church; but I did not think, that a universal inference would be drawn from particular premises. This very power extended to all cases, times, and places, would make a universal father, or Pope. I do not now think, after reviewing the subject, that the quotation of *Amicus*, from the M. E. Church Discipline is at all in point. But in my other essay, you will find a pretty full illustration.

In regard to the second quotation, I take some blame. I somehow omitted to state in form that, *confidence in fact, is power in effect*. This was implied in the quotation, "Rise, then, unite and resolve, as one man, to place sufficient power in the hands of your rulers to govern; that is, sufficient *confidence*." That I had no reference to any change of the Discipline, is evident from the fact, that I had told *Amicus*, and said publicly that I have no hope of any change being made by the General Conference; and also, that I do not believe any change would avail without an increase of *confidence*.

SENEX.

We are by nature in the dark grave of depravity, and we can no more raise and bring ourselves out of it, than a carcass, which is lain in a grave, can throw off the clods that cover it, or unlock the door of the vault it is in.

Taylor.

We can take reproof patiently from a book, but not from a tongue. The book hurts not our pride; the living reprover does; and we cannot bear to have our faults seen by others.



ARTICLES OF UNION

*Between the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference and the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in British North America.*

The English Wesleyan Conference, concurring in the communication of the Canadian conference, and deprecating the evils that might arise from collision, and believing that the cause of religion generally, and the interests of Methodism in particular, would, under the blessing of God, be greatly promoted by the united exertions of the two connections;—considering also, that the two bodies concur in holding the doctrines of Methodism as contained in the notes of Mr. Wesley on the New Testament, and in his four volumes of sermons, do agree in the adoption of the following resolutions:

1. That such a union between the English Wesleyan and Canadian connections, as shall preserve inviolate the rights and privileges of the Canadian preachers and societies on the one hand, and on the other shall secure the funds of the English conference against any claims of the Canadian preachers, is highly important and desirable.

2. That (as proposed in the second and third resolutions of the Canadian conference) in order to effect this object, the discipline, economy, and form of church government in general of the Wesleyan Methodists in England, be introduced into the societies in Upper Canada, and that in particular an annual presidency be adopted.\*

3. That the usages of the English conference, in reference to the probation, examination, and admission of candidates into the itinerant ministry be adopted.

4. That preachers who have travelled the usual term of probation, and are accepted by the Canadian conference, shall be ordained by the imposition of the hands of the president, and of three or more of the senior preachers, according to the form contained in Mr. Wesley's "Sunday Morning Service of the Methodists," by which the Wesleyan missionaries in England are ordained, and which is the same as the form of ordaining elders, in the discipline of the Canadian conference.

5. That the English conference shall have authority to send, from year to year, one of its own body to preside over the Canadian conference; but the same person shall not be appointed oftener than once in four years, unless at the request of the Canadian conference. When the English conference does not send a president from England, the Canadian conference shall, on its assembling, choose one of its own members.

The proposal of the Canadian conference is understood to include, as a matter of course, that the president of the conference shall exercise the same functions generally as the present general superintendent now exercises; he shall not, however, have authority to appoint any preacher to any circuit or station, contrary to the counsel or advice of a majority of the chairmen of districts or presiding elders, associated with him as a stationing committee.

\* This is understood, both by the Canadian conference, and her representatives from the British conference, to refer to no other modifications in the economy of Methodism in Upper Canada, than those which have taken place at this conference, and that the Canadian Book of Discipline has heretofore provided for.

6. That the missions among the Indian tribes and destitute settlers which are now, or may be hereafter, established in Upper Canada, shall be regarded as missions of the English Wesleyan Missionary Society, under the following regulations:—

First,—The parent committee in London shall determine the amount to be applied annually to the support and extension of the missions; and this sum shall be distributed by a committee, consisting of the president, the general superintendent of the missions, the chairmen of districts, and seven other persons appointed by the Canadian conference. A standing board, or committee, consisting of an equal number of preachers and laymen, shall moreover be appointed, as heretofore, at every conference, which, during the year, shall have authority, in concurrence with the general superintendent of missions, to apply any moneys granted by the parent committee, and not distributed by the conference, in establishing new missions among the heathen, and otherwise promoting the missionary work.

Second,—The Methodist Missionary Society in Upper Canada, shall be auxiliary to the English Wesleyan Missionary Society, and the moneys raised by it shall be paid into the funds of the parent society.

Third,—The missionaries shall be stationed at the Canada conference in the same way as the other preachers; with this proviso however, that the general superintendent of missions shall be associated with the president and chairmen of districts in their appointment.

Fourth,—All the preachers who may be sent from this country into the work in Upper Canada, shall be members of the Canadian conference, and shall be placed under the same discipline, and be entitled to the same rights and privileges as the native preachers.†

Fifth,—Instead of having the annual stations of the missionaries sent home to the English missionary committee and conference for their "sanction," as is the case with our missions generally, and as the Canadian conference have proposed, the English conference shall appoint, and the parent committee shall meet the expense of supporting a general superintendent of missions, who, as the agent of the committee, shall have the same superintendence of the mission stations, as the chairmen of districts, or presiding elders, exercise over the circuits in their respective districts, and shall pay the missionaries their allowance as determined by the Conference Missionary Committee, on the same scale as the Canadian Book of Discipline lays down for the preachers on the regular circuits;—but who, being at the same time recognized as a member of the Canadian conference, shall be accountable to it, in regard of his religious and moral conduct.—This general superintendent of missions, representing the parent committee in the Canadian conference, and in the stationing and missionary committees, the appointments of the missionaries at the conference shall be final.

† The understanding of this article is, that the Canadian conference shall employ such young men in Upper Canada, as they may judge are called of God into the itinerant work; but should not a sufficient number be found in Upper Canada properly qualified, the British conference will send out as many young men from England as may be requested by the Canadian conference.

7. That the Canadian conference, in legislating for its own members, or the connection at large, shall not at any time make any rule or introduce any regulation which shall infringe these articles of agreement, between the two conferences.

Signed by order and on behalf of the conference,  
RICHARD TREFFRY, *President*,  
EDMUND GRINDROD, *Secretary*.  
Manchester, Aug. 7, 1833.

Resolved,—That the Canadian conference cordially concurs in the resolutions of the British conference, dated Manchester, Aug. 7, 1833, as the basis of union between the two conferences.

EGERTON RYERSON, *Secretary*.  
York, U. C., October 2, 1833.



BALTIMORE:

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1833.

Since Bro. Bellamy's reply to "Onesimus," "Peter" and the Editor, was in type, we have also received a reply from Bro. W. W. Hill, which we shall publish if practicable in our next. If we have understood Bro. B. in personal interview, some of the Roanoke brethren object to those features in our government which are not truly representative. They wish the Annual Conferences to be exclusively composed of representatives sent up by the suffrage of the classes or quarterly conferences, they of course, are opposed to any taking their seats in those conferences without the expressed suffrage of the membership, and therefore are utterly inimical to any lay, itinerant, or unstationed brother having a seat without the immediate and annually recurring vote of the Circuit or Station. We further understand him, and those of similar opinion, to say, that no itinerant preacher or minister should be appointed over his senior preacher or minister as Superintendent, no matter how superior the junior may be in usefulness, talents, or piety!—That precedence in ordination, furnishes precedence to govern. We moreover understand Bro. B. that some of our Roanoke brethren wish the Quarterly Conferences only to select the Superintendent for the Circuit or Station! If such views should ever obtain in any church now called Methodist Protestant, we hope the term "Methodist" will be stricken forever from its title, as we should consider such innovation as improper to be covered by the term Methodist. We feel it a duty which we owe to our Church, and to its constitution, to speak out when we see the latter threatened with subversion by any Circuit or Station, no matter how much we may respect them in other matters.

If this be not Congregationalism, we must confess that we have mistaken the generally received sense of the term. Indeed we feel that we hazard nothing by saying, that it goes farther. It appears that while some complain of our Itinerant aristocracy in the Annual Conference, that our Church has also recognized an aristocracy in the Quarterly Conferences. Are we asked how? We answer, are there not brethren who are entitled to seats in the Quarterly Conferences, who are not the representatives of the people? We ask whom do the Exhorters, the Licensed Preachers, and the Ministers represent, if they are neither Class Leaders, Stewards, nor Trustees? And yet these brethren are entitled to seats in the Quarterly Conferences—and these who are not elected, are



to have a voice in the quarterly conferences for such a superintendent as shall best suit their views, no matter how opposed those views may be to the wishes of the church generally. We are not now, calling in question the propriety of those brethren having seats. Contemplating our church as a christian and scriptural confederacy, it may all be expedient—But break up the confederacy, destroy the power of the Annual Conferences to station superintendents, and we should soon see the impropriety of any brother being a member of the quarterly conference, unless he were immediately elected by the members. We feel quite prepared to believe, that the members of the church in such quarterly meeting bounds would soon take measures to eject from their quarterly conferences these privileged guardians, not of the rights of the church, but of their own peculiar interests.

Is it too much to say, that some of our Quarterly Conferences have members who never have been elected to seats, and even some who belong to no class, nor serve the church regularly according to what ought to be reasonably expected! We have the proofs at hand. Shall this be tolerated, and yet brethren complain that an itinerant minister (who yields up every thing that is dear at home, who labours day and night to cultivate foreign fields, and who barely receives, if indeed he can obtain them, food and raiment,) has a seat without election in the Annual Conference!! As Editor, we go for the interests of our entire Church, and for its Constitution—believing the first to be scriptural, and the other justly entitled to the full amount of our humble support.

We moreover understand him to state, that we have created an aristocracy in the church by giving itinerant ordained preachers a seat in the Conference, and that he is opposed to any minister whatever having a seat without election.

The Committee who drafted the Constitution, and the General Convention who adopted the draft of the Committee, with such alterations as they thought proper, were well apprized that they were giving to the Itinerant Ministers peculiar privileges, but these were given on account of their peculiar and personal sacrifices, and the obvious necessity of the case.

Whether the Convention yielded more to the Itinerant preachers than those preachers render an equivalent for by their being wholly given up to the work, the sacrifice of their worldly prospects and the necessity of their bring at the Annual Conferences to have their official character examined, to receive their appointments to fields of labour, and to make their appeal from the stationing authority, &c. &c. we leave to the good sense of the Church to determine. We are of opinion, that the pittance allowed to our itinerant preachers is by no means adequate, either to their comfortable support, or to the sacrifices they are required to make.

Query.—Could our Church, or any other, requiring Itinerant or Missionary effort, as a cardinal point in their operations, expect that any brethren having a proper respect for themselves, would be willing to give up all prospect of secular prosperity for the purpose of being the mere servants of any body of men in the church—and be deprived of a seat in that body, in which their destinies are determined? If there be such voluntary humility to be found, we think it will not be found amongst either the most intelligent, or the most pious.

#### GENERAL NOTICE.

The price of this paper from the first of January next until the first of June ensuing, will be \$1. It will be sent to such only as shall have paid in advance—of which all are hereby advised.

Such as wish the present volume from January, 1833, to January 1834, or from the first of June, 1833, to June

1834, are required to pay \$2 in advance, or the paper will not be sent. Postage must be paid.

JOHN J. HARROD, Publisher.

Our friends abroad, are informed that orders for any publications wanted by them will be thankfully filled and forwarded to any part of the United States—also, that any British or French publications they may wish, will be imported for them with all possible despatch—on application to John J. Harrod, Book Agent of the M. P. Church, who receives the monthly list of English and French publications from the London presses.

Selections will be given from our Foreign Magazines, as soon as we publish the present articles on hand.

#### BOOK DEPARTMENT.

The public generally are informed, that our Books can be obtained of the following brethren:

Rev. A. Albright, Rock Creek, North Carolina.  
Mr D Armstead, Chas. City C. H. Virginia  
Rev A G Brewer, Covington, Georgia  
B Burgess, Burgess Store, Virginia  
Payton Bibb, Montgomery, Alabama  
Col R Blount, Hebron, Georgia  
Mr Luke Brown, Parishville, New York  
Dr E H Cooke, Greenville, Alabama  
Rev John Coe, Greensborough, North Carolina  
Mr W L Chappell, Cincinnati, Ohio  
Rev Jacob Corly, Ellettsville, Mississippi  
William Collier, Centreville, Maryland  
Mr William Harper, do do  
Rev L F Cosby, Norfolk, Virginia  
B Dulany, Norrisville, Alabama  
Mr Henry Dorsey, Louisville, Kentucky  
P Enslinger, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania  
Rev William B Evans, Cincinnati, Ohio  
Charles Evans, Wrightsboro, Georgia  
Mr S Freshman, Red House, Virginia  
Eden Foster, Batavia, New York  
Rev Nathaniel Gage, Hinesburg, Vermont  
Daniel Gibbons, Tiffin, Ohio  
David Goodner, Hazle Green, Alabama  
Peter Griffing, Hope Valley, Connecticut  
W B Elgin, Clear Creek, Tennessee  
James Ruckers, Murfreesboro, Tennessee  
Messrs Henkle & Stacy, Springfield, Ohio  
T & B Hunter, Enfield, North Carolina  
Rev C H Hines, Franklin, Tennessee  
J D Hines & R B Collins, Hazle Green, Kentucky  
S J Harris, Williamsboro, Virginia  
G D Hamilton, Princess Anne, Maryland  
Charles Howard, Esq. St. Louis, Mississippi  
Mr Louis Houser, Vernon, Alabama  
Rev B Higenbotham, Canton, do  
Mr John Hursh, Cambridge, Ohio  
Rev Dr J M Jennings, Northumberland, Virginia  
Mr Thomas Jacobs, Alexandria, D C  
Rev William Jackson, Nova Scotia, North America  
Mr H A Johnson  
Rev William Kesley, Washington City, D C  
Miles King, Matthews, Virginia  
J R Lowry, Rains Store, Georgia  
Joseph D Lee, Mulberry, Alabama  
Mr John Leavy, Havre-de-Grace, Maryland  
William Lang, Georgetown, D C  
Dr S M Meek, Tuscaloosa, Alabama  
Rev Dr William Morgan, Seaford, Delaware  
James Meek, Esq. Selma, Alabama  
Rev J W Mann, Carrollton, do  
Mr T McMiller, Huntingdon, Pennsylvania  
Rev A McGuire, Waynesville, Ohio  
A Melvin, Newton, Maryland  
Solomon Mason, Bridport, Vermont  
Mr W G Miller, Utica, New York  
Rev Thomas F Norris, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
Mr Darcy Paul, Petersburg, Virginia  
Rev Thomas Pearson, New York City  
Mr P M Pearson, Washington, D. C.  
Rev A G Piercy, Rockland County, New York  
Mr John Phillips, Union Town, Pennsylvania  
Rev Dr P Price, Kensington, do  
William Patterson, Obionville, Tennessee  
L R Reese, Alexandria, D C  
Dr R Richards, Kingston, Tennessee

Rev R Richardson, Young's Town, Pennsylvania  
J Sexton, Cane Hill, Arkansas  
Moses Scott, Mount Pleasant, Ohio  
F L B Shaver, Abingdon, Virginia  
Mr Jacob Squire, Carlisle, Pennsylvania  
Rev J F Speight, Enfield, North Carolina  
Mr Robert Spier, Trough Creek, Pennsylvania  
J Smith and C Harding, Northumberland, Virginia  
Rev E D Tarver, Clear Creek, Tennessee  
Mr James Tharp, Milton, Pennsylvania  
Rev Isaac Webster, Frederick County, Maryland  
Dr W W Wallace, Anne Arundle, Maryland  
James Williams, Civil Order, Tennessee  
Charles Williamson, Macon, Georgia  
J G Wilson, Elkton, Maryland  
Livingston Walker, Physic Spring, Virginia  
Mr Robert Wilson, Williamsport, Maryland  
Rev Augustus Webster, Reisterstown, Maryland  
W H Wills, Williamsboro, North Carolina  
Mr Olcott White, Zanesville, Ohio

Books, in quantity, may be obtained of

Mr W L Chappell, Cincinnati, Ohio  
Olcott White, Zanesville, do  
Eden Foster, Batavia, New York  
Messrs J M Smith & Cyrus Harding, Northumberland, Va  
Rev J R Lowry, Rains Store, Georgia.  
John Hursh, Cambridge, Ohio

Other names hereafter as orders are received. The Book Agent, respectfully solicits future orders, from former punctual brethren, and hereby invites other brethren and Quarterly Conferences to order, forthwith, stating the quantity required of each work, and the address to which they desire their packages sent.  
Baltimore, Nov. 22, 1833.

#### BUSINESS DEPARTMENT.

##### Remittances on account of Third Volume.

Alfred Violet, C B Purnell, Luke Ball, 1834; Alexander Watson, James Hance, 1834; Caleb Edmonson, 1834; C and T Edmonson, 1834; Ward Taylor. By B Higgenbotham, for William Fisher and H C Richards, all for 1234, By Josiah Varden, for Shoap and Price, John Duke, G H Butler, John Weaning, and Charles Downs. N Talbot, for 1834.

##### Remittances on account of Second Volume.

L B Haggerman, R W Ganes, George Mosely.

##### Receipts for Books—gratefully recorded.

L R Reese	\$10 02
Livingston Walker	6 85
J W Turpin	4 31
S Remington	50 00
James Meek	7 50
J R Lowry	40 00
Jacob Sexton	20 00
A G Brewer	60 00
B Higgenbotham (in full)	41 50
Do	5 50
B H Ragsdale	20 00
T W Pearson	50 00

##### Letters Received.

J D Barker, Z Williams, Augustus Jacobs, Thomas Jacobs, S Remington, W Jackson, H and E Phinney, N Snethen, 3; Jacob Sexton, James Meek, J R Lowry, J P Webb, Jeremiah Orme, B Higginbotham, W McGwigan, J M Smith and Harding, R Blount, John Elliott, A G Brewer, 'A Patron,' Josiah Varden, D B Halsted, James Ruckers, S J Harris, W W Hill, J G Wilson, 'A Village Boy,' Thomas W Pearson.

##### Books forwarded to the following persons, viz:

L R Reese, Alexandria, D. C. one box. Eden Foster, Batavia, care of Walter White, Rochester, care of S. Wood and Sons, New York, one box. Stephen Taylor, Laurel, Delaware, one box. William Jackson, Halifax, Nova Scotia, care of Lincoln and Edmonds, Boston, one box. J M Smith, and Harding, Northumberland, C. H. Va. one box.

##### Receipts for Methodist Correspondent, since settlement.

Mrs. S. Graham, D Powers, W. Steele, Arthur Smith, C. Edmonson, C. Brooks, New Ark, Del. J. F. Light, John Light, John Mewherter, \$1 each, and Charles Downs, \$2.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM WOODY,  
No. 6, S. Calvert-st. Baltimore.